



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/598,540

09/01/2006

Gautam Dharamdas Goradia

KRISHNA.GORADIA.PT6

7088

24943

7590

12/23/2008

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP LLP
12 SOUTH FIRST STREET
SUITE 1205
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

EXAMINER

BROMELL, ALEXANDRIA Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2167

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/23/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/598,540	Applicant(s) GORADIA, GAUTAM DHARAMDAS	
	Examiner ALEXANDRIA Y. BROMELL	Art Unit 2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 September 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 21, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 21, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Based on Applicant's amendment to the specification on November 21, 2008 to include the use of processors, the previous specification objection for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter has been withdrawn. However, because the use of processors was not previously mentioned in the specification, a new objection to the specification has been made for the introduction of new matter.

In the previous amendment dated May 13, 2008, Applicant amended the claims to include the use of processors and memory, which overcome the rejection made under 35 U.S.C. 101; however, this processor was not supported in the specification, and because it has now been incorporated into the specification, is subject to the new matter objection discussed above.

With respect to Applicant's arguments with respect to 35 U.S.C. 103, Applicants argument is not persuasive. Applicants argue that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established because none of the cited references alone or in combination teach all the amended claim limitations (remarks, page 14).

Examiner respectfully disagrees all of the allegations as argued. Examiner, in her previous office action, gave a detailed explanation of the claimed limitations and pointed out exact locations in the cited prior art. All claim limitations are taught by Petersen, Sheppard, Pinkham, or the combination of them.

Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. See MPEP 2111 [R-1].

Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation

During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

In response to applicant's argument on page 14, a prima facie case of obviousness is established when the teachings from the prior art itself would appear to have suggested the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Once such a case is established, it is incumbent upon appellant to go forward with objective evidence of unobviousness. In re Fielder, 471 F.2d 640, 176 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1973).

In response to applicant's argument, Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art combine the teachings of Pinkham with those of Sheppard and Petersen.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine Pinkham with Sheppard and Petersen in order to provide an electronic encyclopedia (Sheppard, column 1, lines 60-65), and to provide electronic translations for those documents (Pinkham, [0015]). The motivation for doing so would have been to create a system that allows a user to access a database with encyclopedia articles (Sheppard, column 1, lines 60-65), and allow the user to translate those articles in different languages (Pinkham, [0015]). There is a reasonable expectation of success.

Applicant argues that all the combination of the references does not teach all limitations (remarks, pages 14 and 16), that the references do not teach "a user database comprising a history of past user interaction with the system" (remarks, pages 14 and 16), "classified bank module to input, organize, and manage one's own documents" (remarks, page 15), "a plurality of modules each comprising code operable when executed with a processor for sharing, invoking, and/or customizing encyclopedia data/records in a databank for improvement of one's knowledge on various subjects"

Art Unit: 2167

(remarks, page 15), "control system... displays relevant data records... on a user selecting from presented options including one of a plurality of 'FIND' conditions, more than one of the 'FIND' conditions, and none of the 'FIND' conditions..." (remarks, page 15), "control system... maintains a history of records viewed by a user during interaction with a module" (remarks, page 15).

Examiner respectfully submits that Sheppard teaches "a user database comprising a history of past user interaction with the system" and "control system... maintains a history of records viewed by a user during interaction with a module" by disclosing a system that records a profile for a user that has previously used the system which tracks the user's previous searches (column 11, lines 26 - 30), along with an encyclopedia bank database (column 1, lines 60 - 65). Petersen teaches a "classified bank module to input, organize, and manage one's own documents" and "a plurality of modules each comprising code operable when executed with a processor for sharing, invoking, and/or customizing encyclopedia data/records in a databank for improvement of one's knowledge on various subjects" by disclosing a system that allows users to store, share, and organize their own documents (column 11, lines 64 - 67). Petersen teaches a "control system... displays relevant data records... on a user selecting from presented options including one of a plurality of 'FIND' conditions, more than one of the 'FIND' conditions, and none of the 'FIND' conditions..." by disclosing a function that is used to search for and display relevant documents to the user (column 21, lines 30 - 38).

Applicant argues that dependent claims 2 – 16 and 19 are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claims 1 and 17 (remarks, page 17).

Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The amendment filed November 21, 2008 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:

"The interactive System functions with a computer system which includes one or more processors for executing commands that direct operations of the computer system and memory operatively coupled to the one or more processors." (paragraph beginning on page 14, line 22).

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Without the new matter added, the specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

The specification does not disclose the processors associated with the computer system of claims 1 and 17. The use of processors was added to the claims in the amendment dated May 13, 2008 to overcome the rejection of claims 1 - 19 under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karin Petersen et al. (U.S. Patent 6308179), hereinafter, "Peterson," in view of Charles Sheppard (U.S. Patent 5832472), hereinafter, "Sheppard," and further in view of Jessie Pinkham (U.S. Patent Publication 20040243390), hereinafter, "Pinkham."

With respect to claim 1, Petersen teaches a user interface (i.e. user interface used with a browser to organize and locate documents, column 8, lines 66-67), one or more well-classified databases to store data user wise (i.e. databases store documents that are user-specific, column 10, lines 19-32), a user database (i.e. each user has their information stored separately, they are principles or kernels, column 11, lines 21-22), and a configuration database (i.e. user's system receives customizations for their own

Art Unit: 2167

documents, column 11, lines 44-63), at least one well classified (document) bank module to input, organize and manage one's own (documents) in the form of data/record(s) in the databases (i.e. architecture allows the organization and storage of an individual's own documents, and also facilitates sharing and organization of documents, column 11, lines 64-67), modules for sharing, invoking, and/or customizing (document) data/record(s) in a databank for improvement of one's knowledge on various subjects (i.e. architecture facilitates sharing and customization of documents, column 11, lines 64-67), and a control system acting as a bridge between the modules and the databases to display relevant data/record(s) on the user interface by finding the relevant data/record(s) from the databank, based on a user selecting from presented options including one of a plurality of "FIND" conditions, more than one of the "FIND" conditions, and none of the "FIND" conditions (i.e. a find function is used to search for and display relevant documents for the user, column 21, lines 30-38, and a dialog box can be used to enter one or more conditions to be found, see Fig 9, and column 26, lines 57 - 67).

Petersen does not explicitly disclose that the documents are encyclopedia articles, or that a translation database is included, the use of a processor to execute code, or a history of past user interaction with the system. However, Sheppard teaches an encyclopedia bank database (i.e. an electronic encyclopedia database, column 1, lines 60-65), computer program code that is operable when executed on a processor (column 2, lines 55 - 64), and a history or past user interaction with the system (i.e. if the user has previously used system, a profile has been created for them and stored,

Art Unit: 2167

which provides information about the user's previous searches, column 11, lines 26 - 30).

Petersen and Sheppard are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of enabling a user to access electronic textual documentation. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Petersen to include the teachings of Sheppard in order to provide an electronic encyclopedia (Sheppard, column 1, lines 60-65). The motivation for doing so would have been to create a system that allows a user to access a database with encyclopedia articles (Sheppard, column 1, lines 60-65).

Sheppard does not explicitly disclose that a translation database is included. However, Pinkham teaches a translation database (i.e. database used to store language translations and mappings, [0017, 0019]).

Petersen, Sheppard, and Pinkham are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of enabling a user to access electronic textual documentation. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Petersen to include the teachings of Pinkham in order to provide electronic translations for those documents (Pinkham, [0015]). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to translate those articles in different languages (Pinkham, [0015]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Pinkham with Sheppard with Petersen to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim(s).

Art Unit: 2167

With respect to claim 2, Petersen teaches the "FIND" conditions to find the data/record(s) from the databank are defined by none or one or more classifications like the Date, Record ID, Language, Source of Information, Index Letter, Age Group, Subject, and Sub subjects, as well as by keywords, wildcard characters, file attachments, associations, attachment remarks, association remarks, import remarks, or bookmark remarks (i.e. documents have property tags which make them searchable, column 22, lines 17-19, and some of the properties may specify names, values, or methods identifying the document, column 23, lines 19-26), including, but not limited to, whether or not the data/record is marked as "Private" or "Public" or either, "Favorite" (i.e. document properties can be specified in a tag as basic or private, column 20, lines 61-67).

With respect to claim 3, Petersen teaches accessing documents using a computer system, where the user is able to organize and share their personalized documents (column 11, lines 64-67). Petersen does not explicitly disclose that the documents are part of an encyclopedia bank. However, Sheppard teaches said encyclopedia bank module allows the user to classify the data/record(s) by classifications selected or added in one or more of the groups consisting of Date, Language, Source of Information, Index Letter, Age Group, Subject, and Sub subjects (i.e. documents are classified in many different ways - by subject, topic, sub-topic, expertise of author, column 5, lines 23-36). Therefore, the limitations of claim 3 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

Art Unit: 2167

With respect to claim 4, Petersen teaches said (document) bank module allows the user to cross-reference data/record(s) in the databank (i.e. data records, or documents, may be cross-referenced, or linked to other documents, column 11, 44-63).

With respect to claim 5, Petersen teaches accessing documents using a computer system, where the user is able to organize and share their personalized documents (column 11, lines 64-67). Petersen does not explicitly disclose an encyclopedia bank. However, Sheppard teaches said encyclopedia bank module allows the user to find data/record(s) from the databank, which have similar classifications (i.e. user may view documents by classification, which allows them to locate similar articles, column 5, lines 23-36).

Petersen and Sheppard are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of enabling a user to access electronic textual documentation. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Petersen to include the teachings of Sheppard in order to provide an electronic encyclopedia (Sheppard, column 1, lines 60-65). The motivation for doing so would have been to create a system that allows a user to access a database with encyclopedia articles (Sheppard, column 1, lines 60-65).

With respect to claim 6, Petersen teaches accessing documents using a computer system, where the user is able to organize and share their personalized documents (column 11, lines 64-67). Petersen does not explicitly disclose an encyclopedia bank. However, Sheppard teaches said encyclopedia bank module comprises a utility for copying of existing classification and previously entered

Art Unit: 2167

data/record for new data/record input by the user, for ease of data entry, with a choice of defining an extent of details to be copied (i.e. a document may be added to an existing document category, column 5, lines 23-36).

Petersen and Sheppard are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of enabling a user to access electronic textual documentation. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Petersen to include the teachings of Sheppard in order to provide an electronic encyclopedia (Sheppard, column 1, lines 60-65). The motivation for doing so would have been to create a system that allows a user to access a database with encyclopedia articles (Sheppard, column 1, lines 60-65).

With respect to claim 7, Petersen teaches that the modules include an export module, which allows the user to export data/record(s) from the databank, such data/record(s) having been selected by the user by finding the same by none or one or more FIND conditions (i.e. user may export, or link documents that they find in a search so that they are available to other users, column 11, lines 44-67, and column 19, lines 58-67).

With respect to claim 8, Petersen teaches the modules include an import module, which allows the user to import data/record(s) built by another user using the same system (i.e. files can be imported into the system like email files, column 17, lines 54-59, and column 18, line 8).

With respect to claim 9, Petersen teaches the import module further comprises a utility, which allows the user to selectively import the data/record(s) (i.e. user may selectively link to the documents that they desire, column 11, lines 44-67).

With respect to claim 10, Petersen teaches the modules include a global changes module, which allows the user to modify data/record(s), delete data/record(s) (i.e. documents can be changed, column 15, line 31, and a dialog box is used to alter documents, column 26, lines 57-67), mark data/record(s) as "Public" or "Private" and/or "Favorite" (i.e. document properties can be specified in a tag as basic or private, column 20, lines 61-67), associate additional information in the form of file(s)/URL(s)/remark(s) to data/record(s), attach a file such as an image, animation, or a sound file to data/record(s) (i.e. additional information from the base file may be an email, streaming camera images, or many other types of attachments, column 11, lines 21-35). Petersen teaches that when a change is made to a base or individual document, the change is made globally (column 13, lines 44-53).

Petersen and Sheppard do not explicitly disclose translating data records. However, Pinkham teaches translating data/record(s) (i.e. textual input allows the user to transfer a written version of a document or other text from a source language to a target language, [0070]).

Petersen, Sheppard, and Pinkham are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of enabling a user to access electronic textual documentation. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Petersen to include the teachings of Pinkham in order to provide

Art Unit: 2167

electronic translations for those documents (Pinkham, [0015]). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to translate those articles in different languages (Pinkham, [0015]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Pinkham with Sheppard with Petersen to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim(s).

With respect to claim 11, Petersen teaches the modules include a recycle bin module, which allows the user to restore or permanently remove data/record(s) individually or plurally from the databank (i.e. documents or properties can be permanently deleted for an individual, and other linked users, column 13, lines 44-53).

With respect to claim 12, Petersen teaches accessing documents using a computer system, where the user is able to organize and share their personalized documents (column 11, lines 64-67).

Petersen does not explicitly disclose a reports module. Sheppard teaches and encyclopedia database (column 1, lines 60-65). Sheppard does not explicitly disclose a reports module. However, Pinkham teaches the modules include a reports module, which allows the user to print reports and/or graphs from the data/record(s) in the databank, by finding the same by none or one or more "FIND" conditions (i.e. report statistics can be run on associations searched for in the database, [0051], and printed, [0034]).

Petersen, Sheppard, and Pinkham are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of enabling a user to access electronic textual documentation. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Petersen to include the teachings of Pinkham in order to provide

Art Unit: 2167

electronic translations for those documents (Pinkham, [0015]). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to translate those articles in different languages (Pinkham, [0015]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Pinkham with Sheppard with Petersen to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim(s).

With respect to claim 13, Petersen teaches accessing documents using a computer system, where the user is able to organize and share their personalized documents (column 11, lines 64-67). Petersen teaches that when a change is made to a base or individual document, the change is made globally (column 13, lines 44-53). Petersen does not explicitly disclose a translation module. Sheppard teaches and encyclopedia database (column 1, lines 60-65). Sheppard does not explicitly disclose a translation module. However, Pinkham teaches the modules include a translation module, which allows the user to translate data/record(s) in the databank, from one language into another of user's choice (i.e. textual input allows the user to transfer a written version of a document or other text from a source language to a target language, [0070]).

Petersen, Sheppard, and Pinkham are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of enabling a user to access electronic textual documentation. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Petersen to include the teachings of Pinkham in order to provide electronic translations for those documents (Pinkham, [0015]). The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to translate those articles in different languages

Art Unit: 2167

(Pinkham, [0015]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Pinkham with Sheppard with Petersen to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim(s).

With respect to claim 14, Petersen teaches the modules include a tools/help menu options module, which allows the user to select an option for customization including system maintenance and updating of databases (i.e. a dialog box is available on the display screen to help the user alter, manipulate, and update documents, column 26, lines 57-67).

With respect to claim 15, Petersen teaches the modules include a master module, which allows the user to create and store masters for well-defined classifications (i.e. previously defined classifications allow a collection to be created dynamically, column 21, lines 39-48).

With respect to claim 16, Petersen teaches accessing documents using a computer system, where the user is able to organize and share their personalized documents (column 11, lines 64-67). Petersen does not explicitly disclose the use of hand held devices. Sheppard teaches an encyclopedia database (column 1, lines 60-65). Sheppard does not explicitly disclose the use of hand-held devices. However, Pinkham teaches the modules and utilities are adapted to be operated within a browser and/or other viewing and/or processing programs and to operate on one or more computer systems including hand held devices (i.e. system can work over a network, or with hand-held devices, [0027]).

With respect to claim 17, Petersen teaches a user interface (i.e. user interface used with a browser to organize and locate documents, column 8, lines 66-67), one or

Art Unit: 2167

more well-classified databases to store data/record(s) user wise (i.e. databases store documents that are user-specific, column 10, lines 19-32), a user database (i.e. each user has their information stored separately, column 11, lines 21-22), and a configuration database (i.e. user's system receives customizations for their own documents, column 11, lines 44-63), at least one well classified (document) bank module to input, organize and manage one's own (documents) in the form of data/records in the databases (i.e. architecture allows the organization and storage of an individual's own documents, and also facilitates sharing and organization of documents, column 11, lines 64-67), for classifying the data/record(s) by classifications selected or added in one or more groups consisting of Date, Language, Source of Information, Index Letter, Age Group, Subject, and Sub subjects (i.e. documents have property tags which make them searchable, column 22, lines 17-19, and some of the properties may specify names, values, or methods identifying the document, column 23, lines 19-26), and a control system acting as a bridge between the modules and the databases to display relevant data/record(s) on the user interface by finding the relevant data/record(s) from the databank, based on a user selecting from presented options including one of a plurality of "FIND" conditions, more than one of the "FIND" conditions, and none of the "FIND" conditions (i.e. a find function is used to search for and display relevant documents for the user, column 21, lines 30-38, and a dialog box can be used to enter one or more conditions to be found, see Fig 9, and column 26, lines 57 - 67).

Petersen does not explicitly disclose that the documents are encyclopedia articles, or that a translation database is included, the use of a processor to execute

Art Unit: 2167

code, or a history of past user interaction with the system. However, Sheppard teaches an encyclopedia bank database (i.e. an electronic encyclopedia database, column 1, lines 60-65), computer program code that is operable when executed on a processor (column 2, lines 55 - 64), and a history or past user interaction with the system (i.e. if the user has previously used system, a profile has been created for them and stored, which provides information about the user's previous searches, column 11, lines 26 - 30).

Petersen and Sheppard are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of enabling a user to access electronic textual documentation. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Petersen to include the teachings of Sheppard in order to provide an electronic encyclopedia (Sheppard, column 1, lines 60-65). The motivation for doing so would have been to create a system that allows a user to access a database with encyclopedia articles (Sheppard, column 1, lines 60-65).

Sheppard does not explicitly disclose that a translation database is included. However, Pinkham teaches a translation database (i.e. database used to store language translations and mappings, [0017, 0019]).

Petersen, Sheppard, and Pinkham are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of enabling a user to access electronic textual documentation. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Petersen to include the teachings of Pinkham in order to provide electronic translations for those documents (Pinkham, [0015]). The motivation for doing

Art Unit: 2167

so would have been to allow the user to translate those articles in different languages (Pinkham, [0015]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Pinkham with Sheppard with Petersen to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim(s).

With respect to claim 18, Petersen teaches accessing documents using a computer system, where the user is able to organize and share their personalized documents (column 11, lines 64-67). Petersen does not explicitly disclose an encyclopedia bank. However, Sheppard teaches the encyclopedia bank module includes a utility for copying of existing classification and previously entered data/record(s) for new data input by the user, for ease of data/record entry, with a choice of defining an extent of details to be copied (i.e. a document may be added to an existing document category, column 5, lines 23-36).

Petersen and Sheppard are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of enabling a user to access electronic textual documentation. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Petersen to include the teachings of Sheppard in order to provide an electronic encyclopedia (Sheppard, column 1, lines 60-65). The motivation for doing so would have been to create a system that allows a user to access a database with encyclopedia articles (Sheppard, column 1, lines 60-65).

With respect to claim 19, Petersen teaches the encyclopedia bank module allows the user to modify a record individually) (i.e. documents can be changed, column 15, line 31, and a dialog box is used to alter documents, column 26, lines 57-67), and further comprises a utility, which allows the user to modify data/records globally (when a

Art Unit: 2167

change is made to a base or individual document, the change is made globally (column 13, lines 44-53).

Conclusion/Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALEXANDRIA Y. BROMELL whose telephone number is (571)270-3034. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alexandria Y Bromell/
Examiner, Art Unit 2167
December 20, 2008

/S. A. A./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162

Application/Control Number: 10/598,540

Page 21

Art Unit: 2167

/John R. Cottingham/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167